

Summary Rating Form for CMR

Summary of Raters

10-28-10  
Prepared by: Greg MacLean  
Selection Committee Chair

Cost information as Submitted: Preliminary Financial Data, Based on \$130.0m Arena Budget + 24 Month Period

10-28-10 Prepared by: Greg MacLean Selection Committee Chair			Phase 1 Cost Per Month Phase II % Phase II (%x130.0m) Cost Per Mon/24 Mons												Phase 1 Cost Per Month Phase II % Phase II (%x130.0m) Cost Per Mon/24 Mons												Phase 1 Cost Per Month Phase II % Phase II (%x130.0m) Cost Per Mon/24 Mons												Phase 1 Cost Per Month Phase II % Phase II (%x130.0m) Cost Per Mon/24 Mons											
			\$140,000 \$235,187 1.95 \$2,535,000 \$5,644,477												\$250,000 \$369,289 2.5 \$3,250,000 \$8,862,937												\$332,361 \$485,756 2.15 \$2,795,000 \$11,658,139												\$298,000 \$375,712 1.48 \$1,924,000 \$8,641,372											
		Total	\$8,179,477												\$12,112,937												\$14,453,139												\$10,565,372											
	Rating Criteria	Max. Pts.	Mortenson / Hampton- Joint Venture												Kiewit Building Group Inc.												Sampson / Turner - Joint Venture												Weitz/Hunt Joint Venture											
1	The financial resources of the CMR to complete the project.	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	54	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	54	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	53					
2	The ability of the proposed personnel of the CMR to perform.	25	25	24	25	25	22	25	25	24	25	22	23	265	18	19	20	20	20	15	24	20	22	18	18	214	25	24	25	25	24	25	25	24	25	24	22	268	23	23	20	23	22	18	23	22	23	20	21	238
3	The character, integrity, reputation, judgement experience, and efficiency of the CMR.	10	10	9	10	10	7	10	10	9	10	8	9	102	10	6	10	7	7	10	9	7	8	8	8	90	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	9	8	10	10	106	10	7	10	10	8	10	8	9	8	10	9	99
4	The quality of performance on previous projects.	20	20	19	18	20	17	20	20	18	18	20	19	209	18	15	15	19	18	10	18	15	16	18	15	177	20	19	18	20	19	20	20	17	18	18	19	208	20	17	18	20	18	15	18	17	16	18	19	196
5	The ability of the CMR to perform within the time specified.	25	25	24	25	25	22	20	25	22	25	25	23	261	18	22	24	20	20	20	25	20	22	20	20	231	23	24	25	25	24	25	25	22	22	22	24	261	22	22	22	23	21	20	25	22	22	22	23	244
6	The previous and existing compliance of the CMR with laws relating to the contract.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	53	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	53	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	52							
7	Such other information as may be secured having a bearing on the selection.	10	10	8	8	7	7	10	10	8	10	8	10	96	3	5	8	4	7	5	8	4	8	7	6.7	65.7	7	9	10	9	10	10	8	6	9	8	6.3	92.3	6	6	5	5	9	5	7	5	7	6	7.8	68.8
Total Points		100	100	94	95	97	85	95	100	91	98	92	93	1,040.00	77	77	87	80	82	70	94	76	86	79	77	884.70	95	96	98	99	96	100	98	88	92	92	91	1,045.30	91	85	84	91	88	78	90	85	86	84	89	950.80
			Average of Score Totals: 94.55												Average of Score Totals: 80.43												Average of Score Totals: 95.03												Average of Score Totals: 86.44											

**Summary:**  
After the interviews, each rater was asked to complete their score sheet and submit it to the Chair of the Selection Committee independently. This spreadsheet represents the results as submitted. Overall, the results are very consistent. The rankings for Mortenson/Hampton and Turner/Sampson are a statistical "dead-heat." While fees could be included in selection committee analysis under #7: "Such other information as may be secured having a bearing on the selection," it is understood that fees and contract price will be a negotiated item.

**Notes:**  
- This rating sheet is in conformance with Administration Regulation #29 and EO 083016 (attached).  
  
- Raters shall consider specific items enumerated in Section 19 of the RFP (attached) as part of the overall evaluation of proposals. Consideration of these items shall be reflected in the scoring of the various rating criteria above.